

**DISTRICT ATTORNEY
COUNTY OF NEW YORK
ONE HOGAN PLACE
New York, N. Y. 10013
(212) 335-9000**

OFFICER: LYDELL BOYD
TAX NUMBER: 901 207

DISCLOSURE ADVISORY

For the person named above, whom the People may call as a witness, please be advised as follows.⁷

1. The New York City Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) has deemed substantiated an allegation of Abuse-Other-Abuse in connection with an incident that occurred and was reported on January 16, 1996.

For this same incident, the New York City Police Department has deemed substantiated an allegation that Lydell Boyd, while on duty, did wrongfully and without reasonable suspicion follow the complainant and failed to provide a shield number when requested of him.

2. Police Officer Lydell Boyd is a named defendant in the civil action, DUANE COUTURE V. CITY OF NY, ET AL, 152 555-2012, filed in New York Supreme Court. The date of the incident is 5-18-11. The nature of the action is police action.
3. The Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) has deemed substantiated an allegation of Abuse-Refusal to provide name/shield number for Lydell Boyd in connection with an incident that occurred on August 8, 2013. A complainant (hereinafter “the female arrestee”) who had been arrested by Lydell Boyd on August 8, 2013, alleged, among other things, that Lydell Boyd refused to provide his name and shield number when she asked for it. In his CCRB interview, Lydell Boyd remembered the female arrestee standing up in the security office of the arrest location and holding her cell phone, but he did not recall hearing her asking for his name or shield number. He said that he did not provide his information to her, but he would have if she had asked for it. He stated that he did not know what she was doing with her phone. One loss prevention officer from the store testified that the female arrestee stood up in the security office and took pictures of Lydell Boyd with her cell phone, while asking, “What’s your name? What’s your badge?” According to this witness, Lydell Boyd did not reply, and instead told her to sit down. The other loss prevention officer interviewed by CCRB provided no testimony that the female arrestee requested Lydell Boyd’s name and shield number.

The corroboration of the female arrestee’s testimony by one independent witness regarding the request for Lydell Boyd’s name and shield number, resulted in the CCRB finding by a preponderance of the evidence that the female arrestee requested Lydell Boyd’s name and shield number and that he did not provide the information to her. The CCRB noted that Lydell Boyd testified that he would have provided his name and shield number had he been asked, thus demonstrating that it would not have been impractical for him to provide the information. Accordingly, because the patrol guide

procedure requires officers to clearly state their name and shield number upon request, the CCRB substantiated the allegation of Abuse-Refusal to provide name/shield number for Lydell Boyd.

4. The New York City Police Department has deemed substantiated an allegation of department rules violation-other department rules for Lydell Boyd in connection with an incident that occurred on or about May 25, 2011. On or about May 25, 2011, Lydell Boyd arrested a woman and issued her a desk appearance ticket. According to this woman, following her arrest, Lydell Boyd removed her wedding band and pearl bracelet and put them in her bag. The woman stated that Lydell Boyd handed her the bag with the items inside but that when she returned to the precinct, the items were no longer in her bag.
5. The New York City Police Department deemed substantiated an allegation that on or about August 23, 2014, Lydell Boyd failed to notify the Internal Affairs Bureau regarding his involvement in a non-domestic physical altercation at a bar.
6. The New York City Police Department has deemed substantiated an allegation that on about February 13, 2019, Lydell Boyd prepared an invoice which resulted in an invoice discrepancy.

Various publicly available websites and databases contain disciplinary information for certain law enforcement officers. Information in such databases about this officer is not necessarily included in this advisory.

Any information herein regarding civil lawsuits against an officer is not necessarily a complete list of civil lawsuits in which that officer is a defendant.

Allegations of misconduct that have not been substantiated and are not pending (including, but not limited to, findings of unsubstantiated, unfounded, and exonerated), and allegations of technical infractions, are not subject to disclosure and are not included in this advisory.

The decision to include information in this advisory does not represent a conclusion by the People that it is required to be disclosed.

The People reserve the right to oppose or move to limit the use of any information included herein or disclosed in the future.

If you have any questions, please contact the Assistant District Attorney assigned to the case on which you are receiving this advisory.

Date: 1/15/21